

**FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES
January 28, 2004**

Chairman Melvin Martin called the monthly meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2004.

Board Members Present: Melvin Martin, Chairman; DeWayne Justice, Kent Cooper, Secretary, Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio; Hasan Mustaq (for Thomas Callow, Ex Officio).

Board Members Absent: Thomas Callow, Ex Officio; Scott Ward, Vice-Chairman; Hermant Patel.

Staff Members Present: Mike Ellegood, Chief Engineer and General Manager; Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Manager; Russ Miracle, Division Manager, Planning and Project Management; Doug Williams, Planning Branch Manager; Michael Alexander, Acting Chief Financial Officer; Linda Reinbold, Administrative Coordinator; Marilyn DeRosa, Planning Project Manager; Tim Murphy, Flood Delineation Branch Manager; Michael Duncan, Flood Plain Delineation; Michael Greenslade, Dam Safety Engineer; David Boggs, Regulatory Division; Joe Munoz, Public Information Officer; Harry Hollander, Administration; Sally Stewart, Public Information Officer; Bob Howery, Administration; Don Rerick, Planning and Project Management; Richard Harris, Regulatory Division; Michael Lopez, Engineering Division; and BJ Johnston & Alicia Robertson, Clerk of the FCAB.

Guests Present: Roger Baele, David Evans and Associates; Rick McFarlin, David Evans and Associates; David Moody, City of Peoria; JE Fuller, JEF/H&G; Tim Montgomery, HDR; Gary Maiers, FCDMC; Rebecca Timmer, Dibble & Associates; Jeff Ford, Aztec Engineering; Rusty Bowers, Arizona Rock Mining Association; Allan Zimmerman, City of Chandler; and Ed Fritz, MCDOT.

1) INTRODUCTION OF THE EMPLOYEE OF THE QUARTER:

Mike Ellegood introduced Tim Murphy, Branch Manager in the Regulatory Division. Tim was Project Manager for the FEMA DFIRM project to generate floodplain maps here in the District. The project, to produce the maps locally, came with stringent guidelines. Tim worked nights, days and weekends to allow us to meet the FEMA schedule.

2) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF December 3, 2003.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Mr. Mushtaq to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3) ORGANIZATIONAL STUDY OF THE FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT OF MARICOPA COUNTY (DISTRICT) AND THE MARICOPA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (MCDOT).

Ellegood: This item was to be presented by Joy Rich. Joy has a meeting conflict and because we are going to present a negative report, I suggested that I could present the findings.

For the last several months, Joy and members of her staff, including Suzanne Grey, who is in the audience today, have been down here at the District looking at a study of consolidating the Flood Control District with the Department of Transportation and Solid Waste Department forming a consolidated Public Works Department. As Joy and her staff began the investigation they found that there were some significant organizational challenges that needed to be worked out, primarily with the Department of Transportation, some changes in structure and management. After much study and consultation, a recommendation was made by Ms. Rich, this is the recommendation that she would have presented to you today, is that this be postponed until such time as certain management issues are resolved at MCDOT. She is finishing her tenure here at the District by the end of the week, Friday. I know there is still great interest on behalf of County Management in the consolidated public works department. I suspect that this will be the subject of some future study in 3 or 4 months.

- 4) 83RD AVENUE AND PINNACLE PEAK ROAD DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT, IGA FCD 2003A008

Marilyn DeRosa, Planning Project Manager, presented the 83rd Avenue and Pinnacle Peak Road Drainage Improvements Project, IGA FCD 2003A008. Approximately two months ago the Board approved the project resolution. The action requested today is for endorsement of a project IGA between the District and the City of Peoria, to cost share design, rights of way, and utility relocation for the project. This is a repeat of last month's presentation, with additional information to address questions raised during the December presentation.

Discussion:

Justice: On the first basin, which is on the western edge of the protected area and flows back to the east then down south. What about those east of that area where the water is coming off the mountain?

Martin: The sheet flow map will show it better.

DeRosa: The two basin sites we are recommending are at 83rd Ave and Pinnacle Peak Rd and a parcel at the base of Sunrise Mountain. The area you are referring to is east or west?

Justice: If you look up there around Hartfield Road back to the east, your last two arrows coming down. Is it going to have any impact to the water flow coming down there?

DeRosa: No, the improvement we are discussing now will protect an area from 83rd Ave. to the West. These subdivisions east of 83rd Ave. are in the City of Peoria. They have some master plan drainage features that were part of the development plan approved by Peoria during their drainage review. The area west of 83rd Ave.

have one to five acre lots that don't have any formal master plan drainage features to provide protection.

Martin: I can tell you that since the last meeting, we have met with staff and the sheet flow map certainly straightens that out. The other question I have is why would the City of Peoria buy a piece of property that is in the county?

Moody: It's called partnering. When we work and continue to work with the District, and as we were involved in the ADMP it became very clear to us early on, before it even went before the council, before it went to FCAB, that to solve the drainage problems in this particular portion of the ADMP, required the acquisition of any land had to be done and had to be done quickly. Based on growth of Peoria and Maricopa County, it was obvious. We were able to reallocate funds to acquire that corner. It was purely, which one parcel is cheaper? The original ADMP didn't care whether the basin was north of Pinnacle Peak Road or south of it we needed just that size. When we pulled up our tax maps, our side was commercial; Maricopa County's side was zoned residential.

Martin: Your city charter will let you do that?

Moody: Absolutely. I think I can go anywhere in the State of Arizona, not that I'd want to. While I have the opportunity, I'd like to say what I said before, the City of Peoria relies heavily on partnering with Flood Control. I would also like to mention that we are also working with Maricopa County DOT on the Pinnacle Peak Road project. And as this project moves forward, we hope to pull in Maricopa DOT for some of the road improvements, but obviously, the drainage needs to be dealt with first.

Martin: Is that going to create a bridge across New River?

Moody: Bridge across? You mean Pinnacle Peak?

Martin: That's really flooded.

Moody: If you listen to the Glendale residents, they don't want any connection. We will probably do the low water crossing, but long term, we will probably end up building a bridge for transportation needs.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Mushtaq to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

5) PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 04/05 CIP BUDGET AND FIVE-YEAR CIP.

Dick Perreault, CIP Manager, presented the Fiscal Year 2004/2005 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Five-Year CIP. This item deals with next year's budget. This item is presented annually. There are five major categories of expenditures in the CIP, with construction being the largest. Much of the land for these projects has already been secured. There are 26 projects that will be active next year out of the 41 that are in the Five-Year CIP. The City of Chandler has requested us to work with them to implement features of the Higley ADMP and we acquired a basin site just south of the Chandler airport last year. It appears that we will not be able to consummate an agreement for the outfall of that basin. Funds

previously included in past CIP's have been taken out of the proposed Five-Year CIP. We were directed to reduce our proposed CIP for next year by \$ 2.1 million, after we had provided the information included in your information packets. We have decided to reduce our proposed CIP Project Reserve by the \$2.1 million, leaving us with very little flexibility in the CIP budget.

There will be 10 major projects included in the FY 04/05 CIP. They are:

-Laveen Area Conveyance Channel; Chandler Heights Basin; McMicken Dam FRZR; New River Channel; Ellsworth Channel; Siphon Draw Drainage Improvements; White Tanks #3 Modifications; Reems Road Channel; 75th Ave Storm Drain/ Durango Regional Conveyance Channel; and the Bethany Home Outfall Channel.

Staff requests that the FCAB endorse the Proposed FY 04/05 CIP budget and Five-Year Program.

Martin: Dick, What would the five-year program reflect? I noticed that one slide still said \$54 million for 2004/2005. But earlier you reported that it was going to be \$51.9 million.

Perreault: The documents that we send downtown on Friday will reflect the \$51.9million. The reduction won't affect the projects, per se, but it does affect the CIP Project Reserve.

Martin: I know it's hard to tell the future, but do you anticipate that equally in the next 4 years after this?

Perreault: Well, precedents have a way of reoccurring. We gave up some this year and it already looks like we'll have to give up some next year.

Martin: So you may have to ...

Perreault: Reduce numbers for future years. I'll try to include somewhere between a 4.5 and 5% reserve. We may have to revisit that.

Cherrington: The basin problem that you had with the Higley ADMP, is that Chandler not being able to provide the out flow?

Perreault: It's the way Chandler submitted their proposal. The cooperative project was only for that portion along the Consolidated Canal within the City of Chandler. We still have to go all the way down to the Hunt Highway and across the Indian reservation to get to the river. We said, the outfall doesn't stop at the city boundaries; it's got to go all the way to the river. That was one issue. The other, the basin itself, pretty much occupies the floodplain. If we just build the basin, it gives us a place for the water to be collected but doesn't give us a way to take the water away, so the benefits are somewhat limited. So we proposed 2 or 3 different things to the City of Chandler, none of which they want to support at this time. Our IGA, when we presented it to the Board a year ago, said we might be taking some risk by buying the land now because we're not sure if the project is going to be implementable. It was better to get the land and hold onto it; we know we won't lose money on the basin site because of the way properties are

going up out there. The IGA gives us another year to discuss it with them before we really need to make a decision.

Cherrington: So the impact on properties that are in that floodplain area?

Perreault: They are still in limbo; this is no solution, no change at this point.

Martin: I thought the alternative was to run it west?

Perreault: We could go back to the east to discharge it into the East Maricopa Floodway that we own and is off the reservation. That is upgrade because the natural flow is really from the northeast to the southwest. There are some technical challenges that would make the project more costly. And another alternative was to just put the basin in and then put a pump station in and try to pump it north to the San Tan Freeway drainage that would be a mile or two to the north. Again, you're talking about a severe change in the plan. So those are some of the things we need to talk to the city about.

Martin: Flood Control did buy the 80 acres, right?

Perreault: Yes, well 70 acres, we and the city worked together, we bought the whole parcel, they own the north 35 acres, we own the south 35 acres.

Ellegood: It's a work in progress, Mr. Chairman. Ultimately, we know it's going to have to be built. It's a question of working with the Native American community down there or whether we put in one of the other alternatives. Meanwhile, it's sort of in limbo.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

6) PROPOSED FLOODPLAIN DELINEATION PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR 2004/2005

The delineation program is mandated by FEMA. Mike Duncan, Floodplain Delineation Program made the presentation outlining the studies that are currently in progress and those planned for the upcoming year. He also provided information on the impact of the Target Budget versus the Needs Budget on these studies.

Discussion:

Martin: I'm always the bearer of bad news. Since I've been on this Board, I think this is the third project we've had in Moon Valley Wash. Why are we studying it again after we've already had three projects in there? We had a project east of 7th Street, one west of 7th Avenue and one at the wash at 7th Avenue. Why in the world would we need to spend \$300,000 studying that one more time?

Ellegood: Mr. Chairman, this was at the request of the City of Phoenix. So I will defer to Mr. Mushtaq.

Martin: I don't want to put you on the spot.

Mushtaq: That's ok, Mr. Chairman. When FEMA designated the original floodplain back in 1979, it encompassed a huge area. In 1989, the Corps of Engineers did a study together with the Flood Control District to reduce the floodplain. The Corps of Engineers, being another federal agency, together with the local sponsor, it took them about 7 years to revise that floodplain with FEMA. Even that study did not delineate the floodplains most desperately needed within the difficult public area. So what we're finding is that within the last 8-10 years, there are a lot of discrepancies between the existing floodplain delineation and what the ground actually looks like. As a matter of fact, in certain cases we found out the floodplain's elevations are below ground. Those inconsistencies actually made the need for looking at the area and the past studies that were done and try to delineate the floodplain more accurately. It's not to say that this would be the perfect study to take all the problems away from the area but an attempt to make it more accurate as of today.

Martin: I'm sorry but there is no problem in that area. There's no flooding in that area, I happen to live in that area. I don't know one house in 12 years since I've lived up there that has ever even come close to the flooding. You know what they need to do, the city needs to clean that thing out, it's overgrown. And they are doing the maintenance on it, aren't they?

Ellegood: Yes sir, Mr. Chairman. That is correct.

Martin: It's just my feelings on it. I've looked at the other ones as a matter of fact, I've traveled most of them, and I agree with you, it does need a study on the area. But since we've done three projects in that area, I don't understand why we're spending \$300,000. If we spent \$300,000 cleaning the ditch out, I'd vote for it in a heartbeat.

Ellegood: Mr. Chairman, we can certainly take a look at that. What I'm trying to point out now, if I may, is the Needs Budget. Mr. Chairman, at your request we will take another look at that. What I'd like to point out on this slide is that the Needs Budget that is reflected on the right represents what we believe we need to meet our statutory requirements. The Target Budget is the result of the guidance given to us by our office of Management and Budget. You can see there are several projects that will fall off there. In fact the Moon Valley project is reduced. So there are two thoughts. We can take a look at Moon Valley working with the City of Phoenix, because it is a Phoenix request. We will be happy to do that and report back at the next meeting. And the other point is that there is a difference between what we expect to get from our budget folks and what we think we need.

Martin: I don't want to be the stickler here, but I have looked at all of them and I agree with you on most of them. But this particular one, we've had three projects and a lot of money spent. Now we're going back to study whether we did a good job? The only problem we've got on Moon Valley Wash is at 7th Avenue; you need a bridge or culvert. Other than that, there is no problem. We fixed the problems that were there. And the money we spent, and we spent a lot of money on that wash.

Cherrington: You seem familiar with the project, what's the concern if there hasn't been any flooding?

Mushtaq: There have been floodings, infrequent ones. The major complaint we have been getting from the residents in the area is the inaccurate delineation of the floodplain. And that is, as Mike indicated, one of the statutory requirements the cities and communities will have to go forward and redo these delineations because of the inaccuracies of the data. So that's one of the concerns, citizens feel that they are not in the floodplain, and how much flood insurance are they paying.

Cherrington: So there are residents who are having to pay flood insurance who cannot demonstrate that they are not in the floodplain?

Mushtaq: Absolutely. That's what the study entails. This study is actually to benefit the residents and one of the reasons that you see \$300,000, as Mike Duncan indicated, is that this study will have to use an advanced level of analysis to accomplish that goal of more accurate information. Two-dimensional modeling is what we're planning to use in this area.

Martin: Is there a motion on Item #6?

Cooper: Are you going to need more information, Mr. Chairman?

Martin: Well, I go back to the same statement. We've had 3 projects in there; we've spent upwards of \$15 million on that wash. And now we need another study?

Cooper: As I understand it, it is really to correct the floodplain map. If you're living on the floodplain, you've got to have flood insurance, that's required

Martin: Absolutely

Cooper: I don't know how much the premiums are but if it may justify a \$300,000 expenditure to save them the premiums. As I understand it, it isn't so much a flooding issue as it is floodplain delineation issue

Justice: Mr. Chairman, oddly enough, I talked to a fellow today, who had nothing to do with this except that he found out I had been appointed to being on this Board. He commented that he had this similar problem and that it took him about 18 months to get it straightened out. And that the one year he had to pay the insurance, it was \$1800, for just that one year. So, to the people who live there, it's probably pretty serious.

Martin: And I agree with you, we do projects...

Justice: Should have been done right at least the first, second or third time.

Martin: That's just my feeling, but I'm only one vote now. We need a motion on Item #6

Cherrington: I'll move to approve the staff recommendation, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what the District could do to satisfy your question. I understand exactly what you're saying, it sounds like they've done it three times and haven't addressed the problems. But if the problem still exists and residents are being

disadvantaged because they are in a floodplain that they are not really in, I feel for those residents. I think they need results, so I'll move to support the staff recommendation.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Mr. Justice to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried 4 votes in favor, 1 vote opposed.

7) **FISCAL YEAR 2004/2005 PLANNING PROGRAM, RESOLUTION FCD2004R001.**

Doug Williams, Planning Branch Manager, presented this item. The Resolution identifies the planning efforts that would be accomplished next year if the Needs Budget request is approved and which planning efforts would be deleted or reduced is only the Target Budget is approved.

Resolution FCD2004R001 authorizes the Chief Engineer and General Manager to the Flood Control District to complete the ADMS, ADMP and advanced planning studies identified in the Budget and Map; to negotiate and award technical service contracts for planning studies; and to negotiate rights-of-entry, subject to the ratification and approval of the Board of Directors and subject to the funding approved in the District's Fiscal Year 2004/2005 budget.

Discussion:

Cooper: This is where money is well spent to get things done ahead of development. And once it's done we can enforce the drainage regulations.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Mushtaq to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

NOTE: Mr. Cooper left the meeting at 3:15pm

8) **FISCAL YEAR 2005 FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT NEEDS AND TARGET OPERATING BUDGETS.**

Michael Alexander, Acting Chief Financial Officer, presented this item.

This item deals with the budget needs for Fiscal Year 2005 and provides an update on Fiscal Year 2004.

Discussion:

Ellegood: City of Phoenix has seven dams that are in various stages. They are getting near the end of their useful design life. Design standards have changed. They have asked us for some help, both technically and in funding. It's a legitimate request and we're trying to accommodate the City of Phoenix's needs.

Martin: Under services, it says "Other" a little over \$4 million, what's covered in that?

Alexander: Basically that would be any service that is not considered an engineering service. An engineering service is primarily planning and delineation. It also includes any service we have for appraisals, any service we have for development of our flood warning system, any service that we have for outside labor, primarily our O&M temporary labor is about \$200,000 of that. Any service we have for the development of hydraulic software, any service we have for maintenance of this building, all would go into that.

Martin: Into the “Other”? That’s what goes into that? You don’t break it down?

Alexander: Yes sir. They are broken down in our detailed financial sheet. All of those items are covered under “Other”

Ellegood: The other area, Mr. Chairman, that is emerging as a cost that comes under “Other” services are security services for our properties. Because we’ve had a number of incidents of trespassing where people have cut fences and ride off-road vehicles. We’ve got quite a liability exposure there. We’ve contracted with internal folks here with the Sheriff’s Office. It’s a cost that just keeps escalating and I think it’s \$50,000 we’ve had to spend this year that wasn’t anticipated in our budget before. So that is increasing over time.

Martin: Isn’t that covered under Temporary Labor?

Ellegood: No, Temporary Labor is our temporary employees. Typically we will hire a number of employees on a temporary basis, on an as needed basis, part-time basis. We also have a contract with a labor supply company to give us some help with our operation and maintenance activities. We used to rely, quite a bit, on inmate labor. That source of labor is beginning to dry up; we have not been able to meet our needs using inmate labor. This year we have had to contract with companies to provide us with labor.

Alexander: Another major item currently in “Other” is regulatory plan review, outside services and also sand and gravel consulting services.

Ellegood: If I might add just another comment on this Needs versus Target Budgets. The Statute Title 48 requires this Board, requires me, to develop a budget, which we’ve done. We’ve presented it to you and subsequently to the Board of Directors for adoption. There is no mention in the statute of the OMB establishing budget targets that we have to generate and what’s normally, typically what we get. In the audit that was completed a year ago, the auditor determined that we were not, in fact, complying with the statute because we simply took the budget numbers that were given to us by OMB and backed into a budget using that. So we started a year ago, in doing this, you may recall this exercise last year. If things go true to form, I expect OMB to summarily ignore our Needs Budget and give us the budget that they have given to us as a target. Nevertheless, we need to identify what our needs are and make this body aware of what we anticipate our needs to be. Understand that it is not a funding issue, we’re not talking about raising taxes, we have the money sitting in a bank account somewhere. I think it’s prudent to start spending this down, to start planning other things, but for other reasons that’s what our Office of Management Budget has chosen to do.

Martin: Would this budget be affected by the report that Joy Rich would come up with?

Ellegood: Probably not, Mr. Chairman. Originally, she had anticipated a consolidation, there were a number of reasons, fiscal was certainly one of the drivers but there were some thoughts on the crew coordination, collaboration, resource sharing and so forth. She was going to put this thing together then have it adopted and

have it started presumably by the start of the next fiscal year. I don't know that this would have a major change in that, particularly because it looks like this consolidation, at least in the near term, is not going to be ready for the first of July.

Martin: Mike, the reason I brought up the "Other" is because I am the director of a public health company and we got audited because of "Other". Five percent of your budget is under "Other". I think in the future you need to break that down a little closer and not have 5% of your budget in the "Other" category. I'm sure it's well spent.

Ellegood: Point well taken and I'm sure we can comply with that. It's not a slush fund or anything. Rather than kill some more trees we decided to put it in that.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Justice and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

9) **RESOLUTION FCD2003R005, SPOOK HILL FRS/LOOP 202L FREEWAY MODIFICATIONS.** Mike Greenslade, Dam Safety Engineer, presented this item.

Resolution FCD2003R005 will authorize and direct the Chief Engineer and General Manager of the District to negotiate intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and others, as appropriate, for coordination, cost-sharing opportunities that benefit District operations, design, utility relocations, permitting, rights-of-way use, construction management and operations and maintenance responsibilities for the future San Tan Freeway project along the Spook Hill Flood Retarding Structure.

Discussion:

Cherrington: Is there currently an Arizona NPDES permit for the discharge from the Spook Hill FRS down to the river?

Greenslade: Mr. Chairman, my understanding that we have submitted an application and that we are in compliance. I'd have to refer the details of that to our NPDES program manager. But part of what we usually negotiate is how this project would impact the NPDES requirements and permits.

Martin: Did that answer your question, Paul?

Cherrington: So you're not sure if they have one?

Greenslade: I know we have submitted one, we have applied and we are compliant with that application until it is approved. I don't think it has been issued as of yet.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cherrington and seconded by Mr. Justice to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

10) **SAND AND GRAVEL PERMITTING GUIDELINES**

Information and discussion only. This item was presented by Davis Boggs, Principal Engineer for Sand & Gravel Permitting. The draft document provides detailed procedures for

obtaining permits from the District and was developed to assist companies in preparing their sand and gravel permit applications.

Discussion:

Ellegood: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'd like to recognize the Executive Director of the Arizona Rock Mining Association, Mr. Rusty Bowers. You may want to ask for his thoughts on this item.

Martin: My primary comment on the report is that it would be nice if the changes had been highlighted or marked so we could see what changes were made. I did read it clear through but without going back and finding my old one and comparing it to the new one, I didn't know what changes were made. I don't have any objections to what's there. But it would have been nice if we could have highlighted the changes.

Ellegood: We can do that.

Boggs: Hopefully there is just one more iteration. We have one batch of comments that are being incorporated this week.

Ellegood: I would request that members of the Board, particularly those in the private sector, spend some time reviewing this. We are a government agency and we tend to think along somewhat bureaucratic lines perhaps. Arizona rock mining industries have been very forthcoming in providing candid comments. We are certainly trying to accommodate them. But this is no small measure in response to great frustration on their part where they have a permit application filed and it sits there in our system for 9, 10, 12 months. . So this is an effort to put our requirements on paper and hopefully streamline this permit process a great deal.

Martin: Again, I say, if the changes had been marked, it would have been a lot simpler on our behalf

Ellegood: I think we can handle that, Mr. Chairman. When we get you the highlighted copies, if you could spend some time with it and give us some comments on it.

Martin: Absolutely.

Justice: Can you just red-line that and email it to us?

Ellegood: Yes sir, we'll highlight it in some way.

Justice: I was thinking if you want us to interact with the private sector, it would be a lot easier.

Ellegood: Rusty, again, you constituency's comments are welcome.

11) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Ellegood: Mr. Chairman, I guess with that, it is my turn to share some thoughts. I appreciate your patience; we had a long agenda today and I realize we're running

a bit over. I really don't have a lot to add. I've talked about Joy Rich's study; it's still a work in progress. When something comes out of that we can certainly advise you. I'd like to formally welcome Dewayne Justice to the Board and hopefully sometime in the next week or two we can get together and do a more thorough introduction of who we are and what we're about. Beyond that, stay safe.

Martin: Mike, I would have one comment about the 83rd Ave land deal. If some consultant said it wasn't the proper time to sell that, I don't know who that guy is. There's something wrong there, I don't think 83rd Ave & Bell Road is going to get any more valuable than it is today. (This comment was made to a statement that was made in the Budget presentation).

Ellegood: I think there is another reason that is unspoken. We're building up a fund balance and we need to spend it down, we do not need to sell excess property at this time.

Martin: That makes more sense.
Are there comments from the audience?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10pm